

**ICANN  
Transcription ICANN Kobe  
GNSO RySG Membership Working Lunch  
Tuesday, 12 March 2019 at 12:30 JST**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Samantha Demetriou: All right everyone, it's 12:30 so we're going to go ahead and get started. If you could take your seats please. All right thanks for coming back from lunch everyone.

This Sam Demetriou; I'm going to chair the next little bit of the agenda so that Donna can take a little break and get something to eat. As you'll notice, we have four 15-minute updates that we are going to squeeze into a 45-minute time lock, but much like me and my skinny jeans, we're going to make it work. So we're going to start off with an update from Elaine Pruis on the Customer Standing Committee. So without further ado, Elaine.

Elaine Pruis: Thank you. Thanks everyone for giving me some time. I will not take the full 15 minutes; I promise. So I am one of the four members of the Customer Standing Committee. You've appointed myself and Gaurav who's on the end of the tables over there. And we are tasked with oversight of the PTI which is the group that performs IANA function.

So four members too from the Registry Stakeholder Group from the ccNSO; that's Byron and Brett Carr. Gaurav and Brett are recently appointed so they are coming up to speed on what the CSC does and why we do it the way we do it and where the documents are and that sort of thing.

We also have a couple of new liaisons that are learning. The ALAC appointment will be made shortly. We had an ALAC liaison who recently withdrew.

So activity recently has been dealing with the CSC-related reviews. We had a charter review which was led by Donna, and we also had the CSC Effectiveness Review also led by Donna. That was a lot of fun to go through those processes. We made some changes to the charter based on the review and we will be actioning some of the Effectiveness Review Team's recommendations. We'll talk about those a little bit later.

So in our work we have decided that we need to make some service-level agreement changes. And in order to do that we have to have an amendment to the IANA Naming Functions Contract. And our work this week has been looking at what is that operational process.

We recently made some changes to the PTI monthly report format, so instead of just having a snapshot of the last six months, we have 13 months' worth of data which is great for looking at trends and seeing where, you know, we might have some trouble spots.

And lastly, we have requested travel funding from the ICANN Operating Plan and Budget. So, as I said, we have four members who one of our goals is to update our community on what's been happening with the CSC. And in the first two years of the CSC, three of the members changed jobs and so we can't really rely on our employers to fund our activity in the CSC because the employers changed. So we're asking ICANN to fund so that the four members can attend two ICANN meetings a year. And if some of those members don't need that funding, then the funding would be used the liaisons so that they could attend. Next slide please.

So our core responsibility is to monitor PTI's function and compliance with their SLAs. We have 62 metrics set up in groups. They include technical

checks and staff processing time. And these SLAs were originally developed by the CWG Design Team years ago. And we worked with the data that was available to IANA at that time to develop those SLAs, but as time has gone by and the markets have changed significantly because of new TLDs, we have seen that we need to make some adjustments with SLAs. And as I mentioned earlier, they are part of the contract and so in order to make those changes, we had to request an amendment to the contract. Next slide.

So here's an extract from the monthly report. Everyone should receive an email with a link to the report or an attachment of the report as a member of the RySG sent to the list. This is an example of what it looks like and you can see one of the technical checks is highlighted in orange. So this is, you know, a quick way for us to see where something has gone wrong. Next.

So for 2018 and '17 and '16 when we started tracking, you can see their performance rating over that time. They've done quite well and during that period we've been able to pick out exactly which parts of their performance that we might need to address as an issue on their part of just modifying the SLA to make it more realistic. Next.

So three of them that we have decided need to be revised are the Technical Check Retest. So someone sends in a request to update their name servers, INS sends a (unintelligible) services to see if they're alive. If they're not alive, the check fails and tries again and again and again. So of course that takes much longer than if it were actually alive and responded, so we need to adjust that just based on the functionality of that test.

Then there's supplement and then ccTLD Creation and Transfer. And because ccTLD creations and transfers are not very common and you're dealing with several parties -- operator, administrator, government -- we can't really expect people to respond in this sort of timeline that you might - in the gTLDs. So we've seen enough activity now that we can determine that we have to change the way we measure the success of that function.

We're going to add a new SLA which is for the IDN tables. So as a registry, you're obligated by ICANN under your contract to submit your IDN tables for publication at IANA, and it's their job to review those tables and then publish them. And we didn't have an SLA in place initially to determine if they were doing that in a timely manner. So that will be our new SLA.

As I said, we have to have an amendment to the contract in order for this to work, and because we don't want to go through the amendment process every time we need to modify an SLA, the amendment we're requesting is for a change to that procedure. Next.

So that's recently been approved by CSC and PTI. Now it's with the ICANN Board and PTI Board for approval. When that gets approved then we can start actioning those changes. Next slide.

So we did, as I said before, we did a charter review. There were some suggested changes to the charter; the Effectiveness Review and then the Periodic IANA Function Review hasn't kicked off yet because of membership composition issues.

But I wanted to point out the Effectiveness Review Team; a couple of their recommendations were to monitor attendance by the members and liaisons. So we did keep track of attendance but in our charter there is a strict attendance requirement and we want to make sure that there is some accountability there. So the recommendation is that the chair actually action if there is some decline in attendance.

Then another recommendation was to capture the quality of the members -- skill sets, qualities, et cetera -- so that when those members need to be replaced we have sort of a guideline or footprint for what might help the CSC maintain its effectiveness and success.

So that's something that the CSC Team will put together and probably request feedback from PTI and possibly the (unintelligible) stakeholder group considering that you folks reviewed applications and pick the members, so you probably know what those qualities should be as well.

And lastly we need to create some onboarding materials for new members so that as new members come in, they can get up to speed on how we do things, where the documents are, why the history, you know, why are we doing this thing with SLA and contract amendments, et cetera. Next.

So as I said, we're requesting travel funding for CSC members; I'm not sure why it says PTI members. We don't have consistent funding from employers to get CSC members to two ICANN meetings a year, so that request has gone to the ICANN Budget Request and we'll see how that comes out. Next.

So in summary, PTI is performing very well. There are some minor metrics missed but we're dealing with those by changing SLAs or they've changed a few of their processes. The CSC has come together as a committee and we've completed all of our startup tasks which a lot of it was just figuring out processes, operations, et cetera.

And our effectiveness as a group is being touted as an example of a multistakeholder model being successful. And I think I heard yesterday from someone that that actual model and setup is being used by another group that was suspended and then reenacted to hopefully make that a bit more successful and effective. Next.

So a few of the reasons for our success has been our very narrow scope; we know exactly what we're supposed to do. Our members are highly qualified. We all have experience and skills in this particular arena, and there are a few of us so we don't have, you know, 12 people fighting over different things. And we have common purpose and goals. Not only does the CSC have a common goal, but the PTI who we oversee also would like to keep their job

and maintain their contract to perform this work. So we're all working towards the same thing. So those are a few reasons why we've been successful.

That's the end of my presentation. Gaurav, did you have anything to add?

Gaurav Vedi: No, (unintelligible).

Elaine Pruis: Are there any questions from the folks in the room?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks Elaine; this is Jonathan for the record. That was useful I think.

Who approves your revised charter? You've made a proposal for a revised charter. And do you get to meet with the Board is the second question. And I guess third is what do you rate the chance of success with the travel funding? Can you say at this stage? Do you know?

Elaine Pruis: You might have to ask me those again. But the charter - the changes to the charter were put out for public comment.

Donna Austin: (Unintelligible).

Elaine Pruis: Okay approved by GNSO and ccNSO Councils. Donna is much better at the intricacies at that level. What was the second question?

Jonathan Robinson: Whether you get to meet with the Board and what you think your chance of getting the travel funding?

Elaine Pruis: We do have a meeting with the ICANN Board -- the Technical Committee -- tomorrow. And I have no idea what the chances are on travel funding.

Samantha Demetriou: Great. Any last questions for Elaine? Great. Elaine, thanks very much for this overview and for all the work you've been doing on the CSC.

All right guys, to keep us on track, the next item we have is an update from the SSR2 Review Team, and I think we just have some of our SSR2 colleagues join us.

All right, Russ Housley is going to walk us through the update.

Russ Housley: All right good afternoon. I think you should have a slide somewhere. Okay.

Samantha Demetriou: All right, now we're cooking. Russ, over to you.

Russ Housley: Thank you, good afternoon. I'm here to give a brief update on SSR2 and where we are at this point. Next slide please.

Basically this is the outline. Next slide. So the SSR2, as the bylaws require, has three tasks we must do and one we may do. So we broke that into four work streams; the first one is to review the implementation of the SSR1 recommendations; the second is to look at ICANN's key Security, Stability and Resilience activities; the third one is to look at the activities related to SSR in DNS and those that fall within the ICANN remit; and the fourth is we may talk about challenges and emerging things that might affect the Stability and Resiliency and Security of the unique identifier system. Next slide.

So where we are is we finished our assessment of the SSR1 and we are thing on those three other work streams here this week; spending a lot of time on that. Next slide please.

So if you look at those three work streams -- I won't read this in the interest of time -- but these are the kinds of topics that fall under the SSR topic for ICANN. Next slide. These are the topics that fall under the DNS SSR work stream. And next and these are the topics we are looking at to see whether there are any findings or recommendations that we want to share with the community regarding emerging Security and Resilience issues. I kind of want to highlight new uses for DNS, but as the ways we are seeing the DNS be

used differently in the Internet of things environment than we have in the past. And privacy protections is on this list as well. Next slide.

This is our schedule. So the second bubble -- the green bubble there -- is what we're doing right now. We're here working on those three. We have a face-to-face meeting scheduled in May. The intent is to assemble the draft report at that point and basically be prepared at the next meeting to share with the community the basic direction that we have for the findings and recommendations within that report producing a report in August for public comment and presenting it to the Board at the meeting after that in Montreal. Next slide.

So of course we want your input. There's an email address on the slide. I just want to remind everyone of course if you send anything to that, it does get publically archived. But we're also here at the meeting and would be pleased to talk to anyone. And I probably should stop there and see if there are any questions.

Samantha Demetriou: Anything? You guys still sleepy from lunch? All right well thanks very much Russ, and if we do have questions we will definitely make sure we get them over to you and perhaps invite you guys to join one of our bi-weekly calls at some point for a touch base in between.

Russ Housley: Sure.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks very much. All right guys we have two other items under the agenda for this block. We had talked -- just as a quick programming note -- we talked a little bit earlier about having a discussion on the PIC DRP changes this afternoon. But I think because we are a little tight on time and we do have to get over to another room to meet with the registrars later, what we're going to do is schedule a standalone call to discuss that probably the week after we're all back from this meeting. So stay tune for a planner for that item.

All right next we have the RDAP Pilot Working Group update. Rick, can I turn this over to you?

Rick Wilhelm: Sure, thanks. How much time do you need me to hit?

Samantha Demetriou: We're ending at quarter past so we have about 22 minutes, so under ten; keep it under ten.

Rick Wilhelm: No problem. Okay RDAP Pilot Working Group on 28th of February - on the 27th of February, the notice went out from Staff and so all of the contracted parties are on notice to implement RDAP within 180 days. That's a change from the 135 that is in everybody's contracts. That was done at the initial request of the Registrar Stakeholder Group and then jointly with the Registry Stakeholder Group. It gives a little bit more time for everyone to implement RDAP and get up and running in production.

The version of RDAP that folks will be implementing is the currently published RDAP Profile which implements the temporary specification version of things like redaction and whatnot. So just to be very clear about that, the version of the profile that's out hits on the temporary spec exactly; it does not anticipate anything that was done in the EPEP. So that's very much on purpose.

As we heard this morning from Gustavo, there are webinars going to be happening on April 10 and 11; stay tuned for those. There's been a number of registries that have been participating in the RDAP Pilot, and so I would encourage folks -- especially now that the timer is running on both this update which is not going to be less than nine minutes long and on the implementation timeline which is now under 180 days long -- so the time is running short. So if you're technical teams haven't started working on this, now would be a good time. And so please come join the RDAP Pilot Working Group because there you will find like-minded folks in a good place for your technical people to get answers from people.

This week at ICANN there is two meetings that are still forthcoming on this. We have a panel tomorrow at 3:15 over in the other building that folks can come to where members of the Pilot working are going to be discussing a number of topics. And then the RDAP Pilot Working Group will be meeting on Thursday morning pretty early if I recall, so folks are welcome to come to that. That's technically a closed session, but obviously if you're a part of the Registry Stakeholder Group to participate in that is something that's interesting for you.

That's probably about enough because we've been flogging this thing. The group will be working with and staying in touch with the EPDP Phase II to be able to help inform that work on some things that might need changing as the EPDP rolls along. But we're going to be definitely waiting for policy direction as always. So probably better for questions than monologue.

Samantha Demetriou: Marc, go ahead.

Marc Anderson: Thanks; this is Marc for the transcript. Not so much a question but, you know, Rick pointed out that the profile implements the temporary specification. And there I think it's worth highlighting that in the Phase I recommendations, those recommendations included a bridging mechanism to allow contracted parties to follow the language in the temporary specification or the recommendations in the Phase I report until February 29, 2020.

And I think we've talked about that in previous updates but I think this is a good time to remind everybody of the fact that we do have this bridging mechanism that exists. And so the profile that just went out is to implement RDAP per the temporary specification. And so there will be additional follow-up work required, you know, probably in conjunction with the IRT and the RDAP Pilot Group to create the, I guess, the long-term profile that implements the recommendations in the Phase I report. So just wanted to add that in.

Rick Wilhelm: Yes so that's the next step that the Pilot Working Group will be working on. It's after the implementation team for EPP Phase I gets spun up. The RDAP Pilot Working Group will be sort of hung on their hip to be taking that output and reiterating the RDAP profile appropriately to accommodate the various changes to the RDDS outputs that are prescribed -- that were presumably prescribed by the expected adoption by the Board.

Samantha Demetriou: All right do you guys have any other questions for Rick about RDAP Pilot stuff? All right so I think just as a kind of administrative note, that as, you know, we're getting volunteers to work IRT staff and support team stuff that we'll just want to make sure that we're staying in pretty close contact with the our (unintelligible) and the RDAP Pilot Working Group to make sure that the work there is synced up as much as possible.

So (unintelligible) Rick.

All right thanks very much. The next item is the GNSO Council update so I'll turn it over to Keith, Rubens and Maxim.

Keith Drazek: Thanks very much Sam; Keith Drazek. So this is the update you've all been waiting for -- GNSO Council. So not a lot to report in terms of actions of the Council at this meeting here in Kobe. We actually don't have any motions to vote on beyond the consent agenda, but importantly on the consent agenda are two things; the first is the reappointment of Becky Burr to Seat 13 on the ICANN Board. So the GNSO Council as a matter of form is required to essentially approve the recommendations that we, as the Contracted Party House, forwarded as it relates to that reappointment of Becky. So great news for all of us, obviously, as Contracted Parties that she's willing and able to continue. So there's a consent agenda item accomplishing that.

The second item on the consent agenda is the adoption of the CSC Effectiveness Review Team Final Report. We discussed that with the ccNSO

Council during our meeting yesterday as well. And those are essentially the two items that the Council will be voting on the consent agenda.

Beyond that there is quite a bit of discussion going on several topics including a Council discussion on the PPSAI IRT -- which is the Privacy Proxy Implementation Issues -- PPSAI - yes - Privacy Proxy Services Accreditation Issues Implementation Review Team. This is the team that prior to the last ICANN meeting was paused by ICANN. ICANN Staff I think in acknowledgement of the challenges for the GDPR and some challenges with the transfer policy related to PPSAI.

We know that this is something that has caused some consternation with IPC and DC wanting to have seen ICANN sort of unilaterally pause that, but I think we all recognize that there were some challenges here as it relates to GDPR so the Council will be discussing that. I'll just run through all of these items and then take questions at the end.

The Council will be discussing further work on the GNSO PDP 3.0 implementation efforts. I think as everybody knows or has heard of, last year - 2018 -- we went through a process of developing a series of recommendations related to efficiency and effectiveness, improvements for the GNSO Council and how we engage in managing PDPs, and in 2019, the Council is working to implement some of those recommendations. So this is an ongoing effort throughout the year, so it's an internal Council discussion on how we can achieve that better.

Next item is a Council discussion on the IRTP Policy Status Report, so that's just an ongoing discussion of the transfer policy status report.

Next would be a Council discussion on the ICANN procedure of handling WHOIS conflicts with privacy law. This is something that's been paused now for probably nine months at this point -- perhaps longer. Again, in the context of GDPR, the Council decided not to move forward on doing that while the

EPDP Team was undertaking its efforts. And I think the recommendation now coming out of the Contracted Parties sort of led by the registrars on this one is for another 12 months of a pause or a delay before reinitiating that work. But that will be further discussion at the Council level.

And then finally, the last item for Council discussion is focusing on the EPDP in Phase II. So I think sort of taking the ongoing conversations that are going on this week within the EPDP Team as well as in the community to take stock and try to figure out if there are any actions or communications that the GNSO Council needs to make related to, you know, establishing Phase II.

And then finally this week, we've had discussion on, you know, sort of three or four different topics; gotten updates from ongoing PDP working groups. There's ongoing discussion of the IGO/INGO Curative Rights Final Report. The Council is looking to try to bring that issue to a conclusion in April or possibly May with a goal towards, you know, figuring out how exactly to handle that situation; don't have time now to go into the details but it's an ongoing and active discussion. And I think from the ExCom level, councilors have our directions as how to move that forward.

We got updates from the Subsequent Procedures and RPM PDP working groups. I think there's still ongoing questions and concern about timelines and the sort of target dates for each of the groups and whether there's going to be, you know, sort of a gap between the two, and the Council is actively going to be looking at that to ensure if there are opportunities for us to improve or to try to think them up that we take advantage of those.

And then finally, I just want to note there's been some further discussions and developments this week related to the ongoing disciplinary issue that was raised in Barcelona in the RPM PDP working group with regard to two different working group members filing - well I guess there was one filing of a violation of expected standards of behavior, and then there was an exchange of letters. This week there was an exchange of letters from ICANN or

between ICANN and the Council for one of the working group members. This is an ongoing and sort of lively issue that the Council is tracking carefully and closely.

But importantly for the community and for the Council, we received a communication from ICANN Legal directed to the Council basically advising us that in the view of ICANN Legal that the leadership of PDPs have both the ability and the obligation to enforce the expected standards of behavior as does the Council leadership. And that ICANN has essentially said that, you know, provided we do it within the rules and the operating procedures and guidelines that ICANN will stand behind us as leadership in the community in enforce those expected standards of behavior.

Let me pause there and see if there's any questions. Jeff?

Jeff Neuman: Yes thanks, Keith. That was a good summary and very comprehensive. The Council is working on a whole lot of stuff and not everything is memorialized in motion and so I think that's very helpful.

When you were talking about the different timelines between RPM and SubPro, you had said something about the Council needs to decide about or something about synching them up. I actually take a different view and I think it's important for us as a group to help our councilors or to instruct the councilors that there's a strong belief that the RPM group for Phase I will fall behind the Subsequent Procedures Final Report when that goes to the Council. And it could be substantial.

So with that said, we should be talking now about the Council being comfortable with forwarding the Subsequent Procedures Final Report when that's done to the Board independent or regardless of whether the RPM Final Report is done or not. And I think that's critical, otherwise we could be looking at some in the community arguing, "No wait, you need to wait for those RPMs to be done."

The question was asked of the RPM Chairs whether they believe they could be completed with their work by February 2020. Two of them said yes, they thought that it was possible; the third emphatically said no. Well, he said in theory it would be possible but not very. At this point, no.

So all of that said, again, it comes down to making sure that the Council is comfortable with forwarding up Subsequent Procedures which essentially would mean that unless and until there are consensus recommendations from the RPM group that the defaults would just be RPMs that were in the last round.

I know that's not going to come up for a while, but it's something that we should be socializing now. Otherwise, those that are looking to meet a 2022 launch date could be surprised to learn that that can't happen unless the Council is comfortable with moving forward with SubPro first.

Keith Drazek: Thanks, Jeff, and I guess a question. How would you envision in your report and the Subsequent Procedures Report the acknowledgement that there might be a change to the URS, for example, coming out of the RPM PDP working group that could impact Subsequent Procedures implementation. You know, assuming the Council were to follow what you just suggested, how would you include language that would basically provide for that evolution?

Jeff Neuman: I think you pretty much just said it; this is Jeff Neumann. Our charter basically says that the Subsequent Procedures Working Group needs to take into consideration any work done by the RPM working group, and then it says if any or if completed or some kind of conditional language like that. So I think at that point, we would provide the language that you said; that at this point there is no consensus advice to change any of the RPMs, and until and unless that happens, same as our default -- the default is the way that it was done in 2012. And then if and when the Council does receive final recommendations from the URS, then it's going to have to be thought about

at that point in time in terms of - hopefully it's during an implementation team for SubPro and they can work it in.

But I think we should cross that bridge when we get to it. We can't really hold it up because we don't know exactly when that other report is going to be delivered. Thanks.

Keith Drazek: Okay thanks Jeff. And just to wrap up there, I mean it seems to me that, you know, there are several steps with Subsequent Procedures beyond the policy recommendations, right; there's the finalization of the guidebook which is part of the implementation phase where it seems that if we're talking a matter of, you know, four month difference or something like that or a five month difference, then that would still be well within the timeframe of the implementation efforts. Right?

Jeff Neuman: Yes. So essentially like if the Council were to move forward and forward it to the Board, the Board does there public comment period, and assuming the Board has already adopted that, the Council then has to set up an implementation team to work with Staff. And presumably, I mean we would hope by that point, that the final recommendations would be in. so there would be time to include it before the launch.

Keith Drazek: Great, thanks Jeff. That's all I've got unless anybody else has questions for me.

Samantha Demetriou: I think Donna wanted to jump in on this.

Donna Austin: Thanks Sam; Donna Austin. So I thought in Barcelona that Council had a conversation because we had Kathy and Phil on this said and Jeff and Cheryl on the other side on this specific topic. And Phil clearly said that there is no dependency; clearly said that -- clearly stated it.

So I thought that that dependency issue was resolved. So I'm a little bit surprised that it seems to be back on the table.

Keith Drazek: Okay, thanks Donna. The dependency issue was not one raised by me as Council Chair. I think it actually came up during the back-and-forth this week between the Subsequent Procedures leadership and the RPM leadership during the Council discussion. They were back to back on the schedule and it sort of reared its head again.

So I think you've raised a good question. I think if there are dependencies, if there are not dependencies, we need to I guess establish that. And I don't know that it's up to one particular chair to decide that necessarily unilaterally. But I mean I'm happy to have that conversation further. But it's not something that the Council leadership or the Council raised. Thanks.

Jeff Neuman: Thanks; this is Jeff Neuman. Let's put it this way. I'm trying to prepare. There's always people that raise issues at the last minute. And if the Council were to discuss and agree that it is fine and that there are no dependencies, they could do it now such that, you know, we don't want this issue raised by certain detractors -- or there may be certain detractors -- at that last minute. I'd like to shut it off, cut it down now.

But if there is an issue, I'd like to draw that out now too. So it would be my recommendation for our councilors to put the question directly to the other councilors to say, "Are we comfortable doing this?" And hopefully, the answer would be yes if that happens. But if it's no, then at least we know now that there are or may be councilors that believe otherwise.

Samantha Demetriou: Jonathan?

Jonathan Robinson: It's a quick question for Jeff I guess on this one; maybe for Jeff or anyone else.

Do you know what the Board's view of this is? I mean because that's the next threshold, right. At some point, the Board is going to have to approve the go-ahead of the output of SubPro and are they going to expect where the optimal work is done because it might be that it tiered all at the Council level, and then hit the same bump at the Board level.

Jeff Neuman: Yes, thanks. Again, - sorry this is Jeff Neuman. That is certainly possible. Do we know the Board view? No because the question has not been asked of them. However, I would think that that is a matter of GNSO advice.

So if and when the GNSO adopts the SubPro final report, there could be instructions from the GNSO or recommendations of, look, we're forwarding this up to you. We're comfortable moving forward with Subsequent Procedures with the understanding that at some point there may be recommendations from RPM group. If there are no recommendations, the default will control just like our group operated. If there are, then we incorporate it then.

I don't think - and I actually brought this up at the Council meeting. I think we as a GNSO need to advocate for our position. So if we believe, as the bottom-up community, that we are comfortable moving forward, then it shouldn't just come out of the blue from the Board. Again, key up the issue now so we know it is an issue as opposed to a year or two years now we're ready to go and it's all of a sudden an issue.

Samantha Demetriou: I see Rubens' hand but, Keith, did you want to respond directly and then we'll go over to Rubens.

Keith Drazek: Yes, thanks Sam, and Jeff, I hear you say, you know, if the GNSO believes something, the GNSO should advocate for that position. And I don't disagree with you.

But I think, as you've noted, the first step is to, you know, if this is a commonly held feeling and belief here that it's a recommendation or instructions to the Registry Stakeholder Group Councilors to raise the issue and to bring it up noting that there could be pushback if you do that -- if you take that action -- there could be pushback from other groups within the GNSO and the Council that could raise the issue and make it more of a problem than it is. So - or more of a problem than it might be.

Jeff Neuman: If we don't raise it - sorry, this is Jeff Neuman. I understand but I would like to seize that out now so we can deal with it over the next whatever it is and figure it out because if it is an issue, then in theory, the Council could try to instruct the RPM group to move a little bit quicker, right.

So there's lots of things we can do if we know it's an issue. If we don't know it's an issue, we can't do anything, and I don't think bringing it up now is going to make it a worse issue than when this issue is in front of the GNSO in six months or nine months or whatever that is.

Samantha Demetriou: Rubens, last word on this?

Rubens Kuhl: (Unintelligible) just answering on Jonathan's question. There is a topic on the Board's agenda on the 14th that reads, "Preparation for implementation of Subsequent Procedures for new TLDs." When that resolution comes along we might know better what they already include in that and what they don't.

Samantha Demetriou: Thanks Rubens. And it sounds like this is something we probably need to dig into a little bit more as a stakeholder group -- have like a little bit more fulsome discussion to get the guidance that you're looking for, Jeff? Or am I misreading that conversation?

Jeff Neuman: I think we should probably set some milestones and action items. So if we could, if we need to have another discussion on it, I mean we could have an email discussion on it and see what members think. But I don't want this to

just kind of go into the either. So it would be great if we do set up a discussion and then set an action item for a month from now to come up with a final decision.

Samantha Demetriou: Yes, it doesn't seem like we've got everyone fully caught up to speed on this. So I think a little bit more discussion might be warranted.

All right, any last minute questions or comments on this update before we take a quick break? All right, we'll adjourn now for 15 minutes. We'll come back here at 1:30pm. It will be our last session before we break to meet with the registrars. Thanks everyone.

Sue Schuler: Thanks. We can end the recording.

END